

Jomsky, Mark

From: Dock, Fred
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 8:39 AM
To: 'Charles Lee'
Cc: Jomsky, Mark; Beck, Michael
Subject: RE: SR710 F7 Tunnel

Ms. Lee – I am not a member of the Pasadena City Council, but rather am an employee of the city. I have forwarded your concerns to the City Clerk so that they may be included in the public record on this issue.

Fred Dock, Director
Department of Transportation
City of Pasadena
(626) 744-6450

From: Charles Lee [mailto:lee1230@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, September 03, 2012 9:01 PM
To: Dock, Fred
Subject: Fw: SR710 F7 Tunnel

To Councilmember Dock,

In reference to Weston DeWalt's August 31, letter to the City Council, I urge you to oppose the SR710 F7 tunnel proposal. Please don't let private interests, eg. trucking succeed to our detriment. Please keep the welfare of the people of Pasadena on the forefront.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Lee
1230 Romney Dr.
Pasadena, CA 91105

Jomsky, Mark

From: Sylvia Plummer <sylviaaplummer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 9:23 AM
To: Beck, Michael
Cc: Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; McIntyre, Jacqueline; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Bogaard, Bill; Dock, Fred; Bagneris, Michele; Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Re: SR710 F-7 Tunnel

Dear Council Members, Mayor Bogaard, Fred Dock and Michael Beck,

I attended the meeting on August 13th and remember that the issue was going to be looked into following the meeting. It's obvious that nothing is being done. In referring me to the August 13, City Council Report, you missed a point.

Direct staff to continue to evaluate all other SR-710 Study alternatives and return to City Council with further recommendations as information becomes available.

3 below:

1. METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (METRO) SR-710 EXTENSION ALTERNATIVES

Recommendation: It is recommended that the City Council:

- (1) Take an action to formally oppose the following SR-710 Study alternatives currently being considered by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority:
 - Alternative H-2: An arterial road along the current Avenue 64
 - Alternative H-6: A highway along Huntington Drive/Fair Oaks Avenue/Pasadena Avenue connecting the I-10 to I-210
 - Alternative F-5: A freeway tunnel connecting I-10 to SR-134
- (2) Authorize the Mayor to send a letter to the Metro Board of Directors advising of the City's position; and
- (3) Direct staff to continue to evaluate all other SR-710 Study alternatives and return to City Council with further recommendations as information becomes available.

So what is being done?

Thank You,

John & Sylvia Plummer

On Mon, Sep 3, 2012 at 2:11 PM, Beck, Michael <mbeck@cityofpasadena.net> wrote:

Dear John and Sylvia,

Thank you for sharing your concern regarding SR-710. Many, if not all, of the City Council share your concern, but must also be respectful of the "will of the people" as defined by Measure A. Measure A states:

"Shall an Initiative Ordinance of the City of Pasadena be adopted to declare the policy of the city of Pasadena to be in favor of completing the 710 Freeway extension between the 1-210 and the 1-10 Freeways, and to declare that such policy could not be changed or repealed without a vote of the people?"

I am attaching a copy of the August 13 City Council report as additional background, which includes the City Attorney's opinion regarding Measure A. The council could and may consider seeking a judicial interpretation of Measure A and/or place it back on the ballot to allow consideration to oppose "completing the 710 Freeway extension between the I-210 and the I-10 Freeways."

Thank you for your involvement in this important issue for Pasadena. Enjoy the rest of your holiday weekend and feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.

...Michael



Michael J. Beck

City Manager • City of Pasadena

Ph. [\(626\) 744-4333](tel:6267444333) • Fx. [\(626\) 396-7338](tel:6263967338)

From: Sylvia Plummer [<mailto:sylviaaplummer@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, September 03, 2012 12:56 AM

To: Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; McIntyre, Jacqueline; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Bogaard, Bill; Beck, Michael; Dock, Fred

Subject: SR710 F-7 Tunnel

Dear Council Members, Mayor Bogaard, Michael Beck & Fred Dock,

We just read a letter that Weston DeWalt sent to the Pasadena City Council, Transportation Director and City Manager on August 31. It is important that you take action as soon as possible. The City Council must oppose the F-7 tunnel now, not later. Please include this as an agenda item for the September 10, City Council Meeting. We will see you at the September 10 City Council Meeting.

John & Sylvia Plummer

1331 Court Terrace

Pasadena, CA 91105

For your reference I am including the letter sent by Weston DeWalt.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Weston DeWalt**

Date: Fri, Aug 31, 2012 at 3:19 PM

Subject: Measure A & Proposed F-7 Tunnel - For Immediate Distribution

To:

Cc: jacqueroobinson@cityofpasadena.net, mmcaustin@cityofpasadena.net, jmcintyre@cityofpasadena.net, gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net, vgordo@cityofpasadena.net, smadison@cityofpasadena.net, ttornek@cityofpasadena.net, "Bogaard, Bill" <bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net>, "Beck, Michael" <mbeck@cityofpasadena.net>, "Dock, Fred" <fdock@cityofpasadena.net>

In recent days I have received a number of emails and phone calls from Pasadena, South Pasadena, La Canada Flintridge and Los Angeles residents asking why the Pasadena City Council continues to delay consideration of an Agenda action item that would call for opposition to the F-7 tunnel that remains on the Metro/Caltrans list of proposed 710 extension routes. To address this lingering question I have composed this email and would appreciate your distributing it to your lists of concerned citizens at your earliest convenience.

Measure A (2001) & Its Contemporary Relevance

The history of Measure A - which was steered onto a 2001 City of Pasadena ballot by a paid political operative for the City of Alhambra - is fairly well told in the Pasadena City Attorney's analysis of the Measure, which she offered on 18 December 2000. (See Attachment F: <http://bit.ly/S5zHr6>). On its face, Measure A would appear to constrain the Pasadena City Council - even all these years later - from considering opposition to any 710 extension. And so the Pasadena City Attorney said when - on 19 July 2012 - she offered her opinion that nothing in Measure A "specifies that it is limited to certain proposed [710] extension routes or means of achieving the completion, even if unknown at the time of the passage of Measure A. "She goes on her opinion to offer that it appears that "the City is still prohibited from taking actions that are contrary to a policy favoring completion of the 710 Freeway extension." (See the full text of this opinion in the attached document: 19 July 2012 City Attorney Opinion.)

This opinion of the City Attorney was openly challenged by many Pasadena residents who argued that the

specific language of Measure A and the language of City Ordinance #6851, which resulted from its passage, did not preclude the City Council's considering opposition to the proposed H-2 and F-5 routes, because those routes did not connect the I-10 to I-210 but connected the I-10 to the 134. Additionally, the City Attorney - on 3 August 2012 - was sent an email by Pasadena resident and attorney Howard Rosenblatt who directed her attention to a Supreme Court decision that he thought she should have considered before offering her opinion of 19 July. In that email he offered that implicit in the language of Measure A (2001) was the notion that an extension of the 710 through Pasadena would be achieved by closing the 710 "gap" with a uncovered route that had been publicly promoted at the time of Measure A's passage and was the only proposed 710 extension route in the minds of Pasadena residents when they considered Measure A. (Note: It would be years later before a tunnel option would be formally considered by Metro/Caltrans.)

Attorney Rosenblatt went on in his email to say:

As stated by Justice Scalia in his concurring opinion in Green v. Bock Laundry Machine Co., 490 US 504, 528 (1989), the meaning of a statute should be determined by the meaning most in accord with its context and the meaning most likely to have been understood by, inter alia, the citizens subject to it (i.e. the voters). Accordingly, to suggest that Section 1 of Measure A should be interpreted in any other fashion (i.e. that the voters favored a 710 completion policy regardless of which route it took ... is not only ludicrous, but is contrary to the context in which Measure A was presented [given that] ... at the time Measure A was presented and voted upon there existed only one [proposed] route through Pasadena for the 710 extension).

A City Attorney Reversal

After considerable public pressure was placed upon the Pasadena City Attorney, Mayor Bill Bogaard and members of the Pasadena City Council, Fred Dock, the Director of Pasadena's Department of Transportation - on 13 August 2012 - sent a Memorandum to Mayor Bogaard and members of the City Council (See" <http://bit.ly/OD3ekY>) offering:

The City Attorney believes that Measure A does not prevent the City from taking positions in opposition to non-freeway alternatives or on proposed new freeways that would connect I-10 to SR-134 (F-5), or that would connect I-10 to SR-2 (F-2) as those freeways would not connect I-10 with I-210, as referenced in Measure A.

While this dramatic reversal by the City Attorney was welcome news to a substantial number of Pasadena residents, they were left to wonder what the reasoning was behind her change of mind and where her revised opinion might be found. After all, her emphatic 19 July opinion - that the City Council could not oppose any proposed 710 extension routes - was readily placed on the City of Pasadena's website for all to see, but now there was nothing. Subsequently, Public Records Act requests were submitted to City Manager Michael Beck, asking that access be given to the revised opinion. Those requests were denied and what is contained in the City Attorney's revised opinion remains unknown.

Without access to the City Attorney's revised 19 July opinion, Pasadena residents are left to ponder how Fred Dock - in the above referenced Memorandum - came to say:

Finally, if the City Council wished to take a position on the freeway tunnel route connecting to the current 710 stub in Pasadena (F-7), an argument could be made that the City Council is precluded from doing so because of language in Measure A and case authority which suggests that initiative measures are to be interpreted broadly.

"*Could be made*"? - If the City Attorney - in her revised opinion - made the argument that City Council is absolutely precluded from considering opposition to the F-7 tunnel, the residents of Pasadena are entitled to know the extent and wording of that argument and - specifically - why it is thought that the Supreme Court case cited by Pasadena attorney Rosenblatt has no relevance.

The City's unwillingness to release the City Attorney's revised opinion is a source of continuing frustration for many Pasadena residents who believe that publicly and privately offered comments by City Councilmembers and Mayor Bogaard strongly suggest that - if the City Council were given the opportunity to oppose the F-7 tunnel - a majority of its members would vote to do just that.

So what is one to do?

Independent sources, whom I consider to be unimpeachable, have recently told me of their putting this very question to both Councilmember Holden and City Manager Michael Beck. According to those sources, City Manager Beck offered that he thought consideration was being given to the City Attorney's seeking a judicial declaration that could conceivably result in the Pasadena City Council being allowed to consider opposition to the F-7 route. Councilmember Holden's response was described as being little more than a suggestion that, as a private citizen, the questioner had the right to file a law suit to challenge the City Attorney's opinion. The questioner offered that it should not be the responsibility of a private citizen to solve this lingering problem, but that of the City of Pasadena.

The offered "solutions" by City Manager Beck and Councilmember Holden could - and likely would - consume a great deal of time to put into play and considerably delay possible opposition to the F-7 for some time. And that, some suspect, is likely behind their suggestions.

In Councilmember Holden's case, it is not hard to imagine why he might want to delay the need to cast a vote and clearly declare his position on the proposed F-7 route. Running as he is as a candidate for State Assembly to represent Assembly District 41, Councilmember Holden has been endorsed by labor unions whose members would benefit from the construction of a 710 extension as well as by former Councilmember Paul Little who is the CEO of the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce whose Board of Directors supports a 710 extension. On the other hand, Councilmember Holden would like the votes of La Canada Flintridge residents, many of whom have been very vocal in their opposition to any 710 extension. Understandably, a delay in resolving the Measure A situation until after election day would be of some benefit.

But what motive might City Manager Beck have for seemingly being in no hurry to get the matter of Measure A's contemporary relevance to the F-7 question resolved? Possible answers to that question abound. One of the prevailing theories is that - if the City Council were to oppose the proposed F-7 tunnel at this stage in the process - the growing swell of anti-710 forces would begin to demand that - following the example of the City of South Pasadena in years past - the City of Pasadena begin to conduct necessary research, to file relevant and justifiable lawsuits and take whatever additional steps it could to deter Metro/Caltrans from further considering the F-7 tunnel route. Taking such actions would require the expenditure of considerable sums of money, and, if the City were to refrain from taking action with the explanation that it has limited funds, it would then have to answer questions like: How can the City refuse to come to the aid of its residents, when - just months ago - it provided hundreds of thousands of dollars for the drafting of an EIR in support of the "possibility" that an NFL team "might" want to use the Rose Bowl as a temporary venue?

Whether this scenario has any resemblance to the undisclosed reality behind what appears to be a coordinated effort to delay the City's taking any decisive action on the matter of Measure A's relevance to the F-7 tunnel question is beyond me. But it is one of the more generous speculations stirring in the public mind, and one that I think is deserving of some consideration.

If, in fact, the City is purposely delaying the taking of actions to resolve the Measure A / F-7 tunnel situation, there is a growing concern that the City could possibly be found in violation of its own Municipal Code, which calls for it to "avoid any action which could be construed by an objective person to create the appearance of impeding governmental responsiveness or efficiency" (See: <http://bit.ly/PVnUpR>) - 2.05.120.8) and could leave itself open to a critical finding by the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Public Integrity Division that, in turn, could lead to Pasadena residents taking legal action against the City.

Whatever the City is to do, it is my opinion that those residents of Pasadena who are concerned about the possibility of a mammoth tunnel being bored under our City and its resulting impact on Pasadena and its neighboring communities should continue their insistence that the City Manager, the City Attorney, Mayor Bogaard and members of City Council act expeditiously in order to resolve the outstanding Measure A question.

FYI: The next Pasadena City Council is scheduled for 10 September.

Weston DeWalt
DOCUMENTARY SCIENCES

Pasadena, California USA

Jomsky, Mark

From: Beck, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 7:12 AM
To: 'Stefani Takahashi'
Cc: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: RE: No on 710!
Attachments: AR 1[1].pdf; AR 1 ATTACHMENTS A THRU F[1].pdf



Dear Stefani,

Thank you for sharing your concern regarding SR-710. Many, if not all, of the City Council share your concern, but must also be respectful of the "will of the people" as defined by Measure A. Measure A states:

"Shall an Initiative Ordinance of the City of Pasadena be adopted to declare the policy of the city of Pasadena to be in favor of completing the 710 Freeway extension between the 1-210 and the 1-10 Freeways, and to declare that such policy could not be changed or repealed without a vote of the people?"

I am attaching a copy of the August 13 City Council report as additional background, which includes the City Attorney's opinion regarding Measure A. The council could and may consider seeking a judicial interpretation of Measure A and/or place it back on the ballot to allow consideration to oppose "completing the 710 Freeway extension between the I-210 and the I-10 Freeways."

However, the City can and will make sure that Caltrans and Metro study the environmental impacts of such a freeway, should they decide to continue the planning process.

Thank you for your involvement in this important issue for Pasadena. Enjoy the rest of your holiday weekend and feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.

...Michael

Michael J. Beck

City Manager • City of Pasadena
Ph. (626) 744-4333 • www.cityofpasadena.net

From: Stefani Takahashi [<mailto:doctorstefani@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 9:57 PM
To: Caltrans.Director@dot.ca.gov; Michael.Miles@dot.ca.gov; LEAHYA@metro.net; failingd@metro.net; boardsecretary@metro.net; fifthdistrict@lacbos.org; kheit@gatewaycog.org; Katzr@scrra.net; mayor@lacity.org; rvelasquez@lacbos.org; molina@bos.lacounty.gov; fasanaj@accessduarte.com; anajarian@ci.glendale.ca.us; pam.oconnor@smgov.net; drosenfeld@bos.lacounty.gov; thirddistrict@lacbos.org; alterawilson@gmail.com; sr710study@metro.net; ron.kosinski@dot.ca.gov; garrett.damrath@dot.ca.gov; QuonF@metro.net; SmithMi@metro.net; Bogaard, Bill; McAustin, Margaret; De La Cuba, Vannia; McIntyre, Jacqueline; Madison, Steve; Sullivan, Noreen; district1; Tornek, Terry; Beck, Michael; Dock, Fred; leslie.rogers@fta.dot.gov; ana.matosantos@dof.ca.gov; Mac.Taylor@lao.ca.gov; angela.hicklin@dot.ca.gov; councilman.rosendahl@lacity.org; councilmember.alarcon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org; councilmember.cardenas@lacity.org; councilmember.english@lacity.org; councilmember.garcetti@lacity.org; councilmember.huizar@lacity.org; councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org; councilmember.Labonge@lacity.org; councilmember.parks@lacity.org; councilmember.reyes@lacity.org; councilmember.wesson@lacity.org; councilmember.zine@lacity.org; Jan.Perry@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org
Subject: No on 710!

My name is Stefani Takahashi. I am a resident of west Pasadena. I was born at Huntington Hospital and have lived here my entire life (except college). I have chosen to pursue my career near by and raise my family here because I love this community-its traditions and security. I am vehemently against any 710 Extension through Pasadena as it will disrupt our community which has already been affected by placement of the Metrolines adding traffic and increased potential for crime. Please consider the effects that this would have on our communities in terms of urban development, noise and air pollution as well as any effects this may lead to with regard to community safety and criminal activity. Please consider the costs of managing all of these to the cities which will be affected, its residents and our county of Los Angeles. Please support us in saving our neighborhoods.

Jomsky, Mark

From: Beck, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 7:09 AM
To: 'ychang@isi.edu'
Cc: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: RE: Pasadena needs to oppose the 710 tunnel -- please add this item to your agenda
Attachments: AR 1[1].pdf; AR 1 ATTACHMENTS A THRU F[1].pdf



Dear Yu-Han,

Sorry, I didn't include the attachments. And sorry for misspelling your name.

...Michael

Michael J. Beck

City Manager • City of Pasadena
Ph. (626) 744-4333 • www.cityofpasadena.net

Dear Yu-Chan,

Thank you for sharing your concern regarding SR-710. Many, if not all, of the City Council share your concern, but must also be respectful of the "will of the people" as defined by Measure A. Measure A states:

"Shall an Initiative Ordinance of the City of Pasadena be adopted to declare the policy of the city of Pasadena to be in favor of completing the 710 Freeway extension between the 1-210 and the 1-10 Freeways, and to declare that such policy could not be changed or repealed without a vote of the people?"

It is hard for one to argue that a freeway tunnel completing the 710 freeway extension between the 1-210 and the 1-10 Freeways using Caltrans existing right of way purchased decades ago to connect those two freeways is not consistent with Measure A, even if individually the council and the staff do not support the project.

I am attaching a copy of the August 13 City Council report as additional background, which includes the City Attorney's opinion regarding Measure A. The council could and may consider seeking a judicial interpretation of Measure A and/or place it back on the ballot to allow consideration to oppose "completing the 710 Freeway extension between the 1-210 and the 1-10 Freeways."

Thank you for your involvement in this important issue for Pasadena. Enjoy the rest of your holiday weekend and feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.

...Michael

Michael J. Beck

City Manager • City of Pasadena
Ph. (626) 744-4333 • www.cityofpasadena.net

From: Yu-Han Chang [mailto:ychang@isi.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 10:49 PM
To: Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; McIntyre, Jacqueline; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Bogaard, Bill; Beck, Michael; Dock, Fred

Cc: pdrouet@earthlink.net

Subject: Pasadena needs to oppose the 710 tunnel -- please add this item to your agenda

Dear esteemed council members and city officials,

I'm sure you have received many letters on this topic already. Here is one more asking you to place the 710 topic on the agenda on the next city council meeting and to oppose the new 710 tunnel freeway extension. Please do not hide behind Measure A. Measure A was in favor of a very different project, referring to "completing the 710 Freeway extension between the 1-210 and the 1-10 Freeways," and "the" project consisted of a large surface freeway along a well-specified alignment. As you know, Metro/Caltrans are now studying an entirely new project, from scratch, beginning with evaluations of alternatives that span light rail, BRT, and new freeways ranging from Highland Park to Arcadia. This is not "the 710 Freeway extension." This new project does not even have a specific alignment pinned down yet for its tunnel. Or if it is "the" project from decades ago, then Metro/Caltrans is purposefully misleading the public into thinking they are supposedly studying a new project with no particular end objective construction project in mind. If you need to, just oppose the entire study!

Our beautiful city does not deserve to be at the end of the mega-exhaust pipe that will be the four mile tunnel from Alhambra to Pasadena's vibrant old town. Why should Pasadena's downtown area end up receiving the thousands of dirty trucks delivering non-local goods from the southern ports to points north and east? What benefit does pollution, lung cancer, congestion, and declining property values bring to our wonderful city? Will you really allow this to be approved under your watch? We, as a united city, must take action. Now.

Other points to consider:

The project is being studied due to earmarked funds in Measure R. This money can be transferred to other projects beginning in 2019. We should make sure this happens. We should never have allowed the project to be included in Measure R in the first place. Measure R was falsely trumpeted as a transit tax! We should approve a resolution requesting Metro to commit to this transfer.

There has never been a comprehensive comparative study done between this project and the many other worthy projects worth completing in the region. The LRTP lists the project as a top-tier project, but does not back it up with evidence and comparative analysis.

And never let anyone tell you there is a "710 gap." The I-710 ends in Alhambra. Just like SR-2 ends in Atwater Village / Silver Lake. Or the SR-90 ends in Culver City. No one in their right mind would suggest there is a "gap" between the current SR-2 terminus and the 101 and even the 405. The original plans called for SR-2 to be completed all the way through Beverly Hills to the 405! Similarly the SR-90 was supposed to go through South LA to the I-110! There is no gap. Caltrans is simply trying to build a brand NEW mega-freeway.

Sincerely Yours,
Yu-Han Chang

1107 Laguna Rd
Pasadena, CA 91105

Yu-Han Chang
Research Assistant Professor
Information Sciences Institute
Department of Computer Science, USC

(e) ychang@isi.edu
(m) +1 617 678 2486

Jomsky, Mark

From: Beck, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 7:08 AM
To: 'abiraali@me.com'
Cc: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: RE: please oppose the 710 extension
Attachments: AR 1[1].pdf; AR 1 ATTACHMENTS A THRU F[1].pdf



Dear Abira,

Thank you for sharing your concern regarding SR-710. Many, if not all, of the City Council share your concern, but must also be respectful of the "will of the people" as defined by Measure A. Measure A states:

"Shall an Initiative Ordinance of the City of Pasadena be adopted to declare the policy of the city of Pasadena to be in favor of completing the 710 Freeway extension between the 1-210 and the 1-10 Freeways, and to declare that such policy could not be changed or repealed without a vote of the people?"

I am attaching a copy of the August 13 City Council report as additional background, which includes the City Attorney's opinion regarding Measure A. The council could and may consider seeking a judicial interpretation of Measure A and/or place it back on the ballot to allow consideration to oppose "completing the 710 Freeway extension between the I-210 and the I-10 Freeways."

Thank you for your involvement in this important issue for Pasadena. Enjoy the rest of your holiday weekend and feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.

...Michael

Michael J. Beck

City Manager • City of Pasadena
Ph. (626) 744-4333 • www.cityofpasadena.net

From: abiraali@me.com [<mailto:abiraali@me.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 10:25 PM
To: Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; McIntyre, Jacqueline; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Bogaard, Bill; Beck, Michael; Dock, Fred
Subject: please oppose the 710 extension

Dear members of Pasadena City College,

I am the director of a small children's art program that serves the North West Section of Pasadena. I love the city of Pasadena and have tried to be a positive influence in the neighborhood where our program is located. I am writing to you today to ask you to consider the **no build option for the 710**, and to oppose an extension of this massive freeway or tunnel through the wonderful city of Pasadena. It will not be helpful, it will be a historic error, it is not an improvement. Better public transportation and clean air alternatives should be considered, Pasadena does not need another freeway or toll tunnel. Please require that **Cal Trans be transparent** and complete in their reasons for this project, and require the study be comprehensive on the impact of the air quality, construction time frame, and true impact that this project will have on the lives of the people in Pasadena. Do you want to serve the needs of the freight coming from Long Beach ports or the people of Pasadena? Please choose NO BUILD on the 710 as the answer.

Abira Ali

Director
Wisdom Arts Laboratory
520 E Orange Grove Blvd.
Pasadena CA 91104-4351

626 318 0897

Jomsky, Mark

From: Beck, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 7:01 AM
To: 'n chan'
Cc: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: RE: No to the 710 and Tunnel
Attachments: AR 1[1].pdf; AR 1 ATTACHMENTS A THRU F[1].pdf



Dear Naadia,

Thank you for sharing your concern regarding SR-710. Many, if not all, of the City Council share your concern, but must also be respectful of the "will of the people" as defined by Measure A. Measure A states:

"Shall an Initiative Ordinance of the City of Pasadena be adopted to declare the policy of the city of Pasadena to be in favor of completing the 710 Freeway extension between the 1-210 and the 1-10 Freeways, and to declare that such policy could not be changed or repealed without a vote of the people?"

I am attaching a copy of the August 13 City Council report as additional background, which includes the City Attorney's opinion regarding Measure A. The council could and may consider seeking a judicial interpretation of Measure A and/or place it back on the ballot to allow consideration to oppose "completing the 710 Freeway extension between the I-210 and the I-10 Freeways."

Thank you for your involvement in this important issue for Pasadena. Enjoy the rest of your holiday weekend and feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.

...Michael

Michael J. Beck

City Manager • City of Pasadena
Ph. (626) 744-4333 • www.cityofpasadena.net

From: n chan [mailto:nchan_porter@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 3:24 AM
To: Robinson, Jacques; McAustin, Margaret; McIntyre, Jacqueline; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Tornek, Terry; Bogaard, Bill; Beck, Michael; Dock, Fred
Cc: Sylvia Plummer; freddiehannan@gmail.com; sinaad@charter.net
Subject: No to the 710 and Tunnel

To whom it may concern:

My husband (Simon Porter) and I live at 1344 Annandale Terrace, Pasadena CA., 91105. We purchased our beautiful home in 2009, and prior to that we lived on West California Blvd., Pasadena for 13 years. In total we have lived in Pasadena for about 16 years. Although it wasn't easy for us to do, we specifically chose to purchase a home in Pasadena because of the outstanding quality of life this community has to offer. I am therefore requesting that you support our fight against the extension of the 710 freeway and the construction of the proposed tunnel.

I am Foreign Service Officer and spend most of the year working overseas. Coming home to Pasadena to see my husband and enjoy this beautiful neighborhood and community are some of the very few things that I can really look forward to. In my line of work, we work hard to make sure that organizations using public funds, are accountable and transparent in their operations, and show how fraud, waste and abuse can hurt both organizations and communities. Therefore, when I read the auditor's report citing the corruption at Caltrans that included: a) renting houses below market prices to state employees; b) awarding contracts to the same contractor that had family ties; and

c) paying more money to repair a roof of one of the houses rented below market, it made it all the more important to me (even if I did not live in Pasadena) to fight against the 710 freeway extension and the proposed construction of a tunnel.

In America, a very large majority of us do believe in accountability and transparency, and we certainly do not think that it is ok for a government entity or for any entity to defraud society, waste public funds, or abuse its authority. From the information provided, the proposals to extend the 710 freeway and to construct a tunnel is coming from an organization that lacks credibility and integrity. Therefore, Caltrans (and all other parties in favor of extending the 710 freeway and constructing a tunnel) need be 100% transparent about why they support these proposals. Caltrans also needs to provide a realistic accounting of the proposed costs for these projects as well as to show clearly who will actually be paying the brunt of these expenses and who will earn financial benefits if these projects were to proceed as proposed. Additionally, Caltrans needs to publish a complete and accurate list of all organizations that are in support of these projects, and fully disclose any and all relationships between Caltrans and these organizations that could be construed as a conflict of interest. When this fight started I made it clear to my community that I would do whatever I could to support the cause even though I cannot be there to attend meeting etc. I plan to be home for a short break in October and will participate in any way I can.

Thank you for your time. I hope that our community can continue to depend on your support in our fight to stop the 710 freeway extension and the construction of the proposed tunnel.

Yours respectfully,
Naadia Porter

Jomsky, Mark

From: Jerry Beale <jbeale@drmusic.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 1:38 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: SR 710

Dear City Clerk Jomsky,

Attached is an email I have just sent to the entire City Council. I thought you might be interested as this seems to be a major focus in my district and will be for some time.

Remember the City Council Meeting on 13 August when hoards of Pasadena residents showed up to make sure the council got the message NO 710 IN ANY FASHION? It has been brought to my attention that the City Attorney and Manager have really done nothing on this due to a measure that was hand fed to Councilman Holden by the City of Alhambra 11 years ago. This measure passed without the understanding everyone now has about the goals of the Ports and Trucking Industry. 14000 trucks a day funneled up from Long Beach plus twice as many cars? Is that what you want for Pasadena? Further gridlock and horrendous pollution--to increase the profits of ports, trucking and retail stores--all located outside of Pasadena?

Please do everything you can to get the City Council of Pasadena on record opposing METRO's tunnel and ANY further development of a 710 freeway scheme thru Pasadena.

I hear that in South Pasadena the only way to get elected is to be as strongly opposed to the 710 as possible. Seeing the outpouring of concern that occurred on August 13, it will probably be coming to Pasadena too. Having one's home and way of life threatened by bureaucracy is a major motivation to get involved with one's local government.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,
Jerry Beale
1330 La Loma Road
Pasadena, CA 91105

626 221-1818

Jomsky, Mark

From: Dock, Fred
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 1:01 PM
To: 'margaret chew'
Cc: Jomsky, Mark; Beck, Michael
Subject: RE: 710 Fwy.

Your request is being forwarded to the City Clerk and City Manager.

Fred Dock, Director
Department of Transportation
City of Pasadena
(626) 744-6450

From: margaret chew [<mailto:mchew999@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 12:53 PM
To: Dock, Fred
Subject: 710 Fwy.

Please put this subject matter on the 9/10 or 9/24 agenda. There should be follow through on what was discussed at the 8/13 meeting, as soon as possible.

Thank you,
Douglas and Margaret Chew

Flores, Silvia

Subject: FW: No 710 extensions - matters not on agenda
Attachments: 9.10.12 No F7.pdf; ATT00001.htm

From: Jomsky, Mark
Sent: Sunday, September 09, 2012 5:50 PM
To: Flores, Silvia
Subject: Fwd: No 710 extensions - matters not on agenda

From: Audrey O'Kelley <aokelley@msn.com>
Date: September 9, 2012 5:48:39 PM PDT
To: mjomsky <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: No 710 extensions - matters not on agenda

Hi Mark,

Could you please forward the attached to the Mayor and Council members for Monday's city council meeting.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Audrey

September 8, 2012

Via E-Mail
Mayor William Bogaard
Members of the City Council
100 N. Garfield Ave. Room S228
Pasadena, CA 91109

RE: Extending the 710, the F7 Tunnel - not on agenda

Dear Mayor and Council members,

I am pleased that the cities of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale and South Pasadena, Assemblymen Portantino and Gatto, numerous community groups, and hundreds of citizens oppose the F7 tunnel to extend the 710 Freeway. I hope you will join us.

The City of Pasadena has been degraded by past transportation solutions, and now, we are at a tipping point. The tunnel would bore right into the sweet spot of Pasadena. Huntington Hospital, numerous schools, Old Pasadena and more would be hard hit by the tunnel and a multi lane corridor filled with trucks and cars coursing through the 210, 710, 134 and 110 and a huge Pasadena interchange. There might be short term economic gains through increased business activity during destruction and construction phases of the project. But what about the long term prognosis for home values and robust business development and retail activity in west and northwest Pasadena. I think it might be poor.

No persuasive case has been made for F7 (or any of the final options proffered by Metro.) Though offered, no other car and truck traffic solutions have been considered. One interesting 21st Century solution to improve traffic flow and improve goods movement is the zero emissions freight pipeline. It has been approved by the Sierra Club of Los Angeles (<http://gridlogisticsinc.com/action.html>) and other NO 710 advocates. Check it out on www.freightpipeline.com.

Pasadena has nothing to gain and everything to lose from the F7 tunnel. I know all of you are concerned about our physical health as well as our economic health. I hope you will oppose Metro's plans and request that they provide safe, long term, cost effective solutions to the ever growing car and truck traffic on our highways.

Sincerely,

Audrey O'Kelley
Pasadena resident

Cc: Michael Beck